

of the Cornhusker project, those are going to be primarily owned by the public entity. Now we are going to another type of structure and it seems to me that it is different in two respects. First of all, it is not going to be owned by the public entity, and secondly, you are not talking about something where you are going to compete with other states. To me, one of the attractive, the attractive part of the proposition with the Cornhusker project was that you are actually competing with other states. A convention center, you are trying to get business in from other states. Now you are into sale barns and there is going to be a sale barn in the area if the market demands it one way or the other so why are we spending public money, and again I assert we are spending public money. Why are we spending public money to do this? What if it is grocery stores next week? What is wrong with a grocery store? Are we going to spend public money to build grocery stores? Where does this process end? It seems to me that one logical point that you cut this off is whether the business is the type of business where you need to compete with other states for the business and that can distinguish the Cornhusker project I think from this type of a project. Otherwise, I don't know what distinctions you do make and I can't understand for the life of me why we want to go down the road of public spending on what are essentially commercial enterprises even when those enterprises are going to be located here anyway. We are already caught up in that mire with industrial development bonds. Here we are all over this country, and I have mentioned this before, competing with each other by issuing industrial development bonds and it doesn't make sense anywhere anymore because every state in the Union almost has industrial development bonds so there is no competitive edge but we are contributing to commercial development with public money and there is absolutely no purpose to it anymore and there is no purpose to this, I don't think. Thank you.

SPEAKER MARVEL: Senator Kahle.

SENATOR KAHLE: Mr. Speaker and members, I oppose the Cullan amendment. I have had a little experience in this field. We had a public sale barn in Kearney for a number of years. Stock was sold and we had some three, four, five hundred stockholders. It is not a business that works very well publicly owned. There is a lot of things that go on in sale barns. A good sale barn operator goes out into the field or to the farms and he can make some sort of a commitment to that rancher as to what he thinks